



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/775,747	02/09/2004	Edward J. Gough	37167-8012.US00	8688
22918	7590	09/05/2007		
PERKINS COIE LLP P.O. BOX 2168 MENLO PARK, CA 94026			EXAMINER PEFFLEY, MICHAEL F	
			ART UNIT 3739	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 09/05/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/775,747

Applicant(s)

GOUGH ET AL.

Examiner

Michael Peffley

Art Unit

3739

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 July 2007.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,7-9,11,12,15,18-21,23,24,30-32 and 34-37 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3,7-9,11,12,15,18-21,23,24,30-32 and 34-37 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 July 2007 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☒ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

***Oath/Declaration***

It does not state that the person making the oath or declaration acknowledges the duty to disclose to the Office all information known to the person to be material to patentability as defined in 37 CFR 1.56.

Applicant acknowledges the duty to disclose information material to "examination", which term is incorrect. Correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

Claims 1-3, 7-9, 11, 12, 15, 18-21, 23, 24 and 30-32 and 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lax et al 95,486,161) in view of the teachings of LeVeen et al (5,827,276) and Edwards et al (5,370,675).

Lax et al disclose a system that includes a conductive introducer (42), at least one antenna (36) positioned in the introducer and deployable from the introducer with curvature for treating a selected tissue mass. Lax et al fail to disclose the introducer connected to a source of energy, and fail to disclose the use of a sensor to control the delivery of energy. Lax et al teach that the introducer is more rigid than the antennas (see Figures) and that the introducer is rigid enough to be introduced through tissue. Also, a slidable insulation sleeve (Figure 5) is provided around the electrode to create a desired ablation volume.

LeVeen et al disclose an analogous system that includes an introducer (12) and a plurality of antennas (24) positioned in the introducer and deployable therefrom with a changing direction of travel (i.e. curved). In particular, LeVeen et al teach that the

Art Unit: 3739

introducer may be connected to the energy source so as to provide bipolar energy to tissue. LeVeen et al also disclose the known use of multiple electrodes deployable from the introducer.

With regard to the microwave antennas, the previously addressed Edwards et al device is a substantially identical device that includes an introducer with a plurality of stylets deployable therefrom. Edwards et al specifically disclose the well-known substitution of RF electrodes for microwave antennas in such a system to provide an alternative energy delivery modality for treating tissue. Moreover, applicant's own specification indicates the ready substitution of RF electrodes for microwave antennas and makes no statement of criticality for using one modality in favor of the other. Edwards et al also teach of providing temperature sensors to monitor temperature and control the delivery of energy accordingly, as well as the use of infusion to provide treatment and cooling fluids to tissue.

To have provided the Lax et al system with the introducer connected to the energy source to provide bipolar energy delivery to tissue would have been an obvious modification for one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the teaching of LeVeen et al. To have further used microwave antennas in lieu of the RF electrodes as an alternative treatment modality would have been an obvious consideration for one of ordinary skill in the art, particularly since Edwards et al teach that such a substitution is generally known in the art. Finally, to have provided the Lax et al system with a temperature feedback control system and fluid delivery capability to control tissue parameters during treatment

Art Unit: 3739

would have been an obvious modification for one of ordinary skill in the art in view of the Edwards et al.

Claim 34 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lax et al, LeVeen et al ('276) and Edwards et al ('675) and further in view of the teaching of Edwards et al (5,507,743).

The combination of the Edwards et al teaching of using microwave antennas or RF electrodes to treat tissue and temperature sensors to control the delivery of energy has been previously addressed. The examiner maintains that LeVeen et al disclose providing an introducer that has an electrode (Figures 5 and 7), and that such a teach would properly motivate one of ordinary skill in the art to use the Lax et al introducer as an electrode. The electrodes in Figure 5 both deliver RF energy, but the examiner maintains that to have provided one set as microwave electrodes and the other set as RF electrodes would have been an obvious consideration in view of the Edwards et al ('675) teaching. However, to further support such an assertion, attention is directed to the Edwards et al ('743) device that includes an introducer and a plurality of deployed electrodes. In particular, Edwards et al teach that the outer electrode may deliver microwave energy to heat peripheral tissue while RF energy is delivered to the inner electrode to ablate tumor tissue. The examiner maintains that this is a clear teaching of using two separate energy modalities for the treatment of tumor tissue.

To have provided the Lax et al system, as modified by the teachings of LeVeen et al and Edwards et al, with set of microwave antennas as well as a set of RF

Art Unit: 3739

electrodes to treat the tumor tissue with two different energy modalities would have been an obvious consideration for one of ordinary skill in the art, particularly in view of the teaching of Edwards et al ('743).

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments with respect to the pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael Peffley whose telephone number is (571) 272-4770. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri from 7am-4pm.

Art Unit: 3739

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Linda Dvorak can be reached on (571) 272-4764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Peffley/  
Primary Examiner  
Art Unit 3739

/mp/  
August 24, 2007